



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	36287-02001	2495

27171 7590 03/11/2005

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

EXAMINER

GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,403

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14-16 recite "a method" in the preamble, however, the independent claim 11 in which claims 14-16 depend on recite "a computer readable medium". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is not tangibly embodied as it is only software per se. It is suggested that the claimed subject matter "computer executable software

Art Unit: 2133

code ..." should be changed to "computer executable code stored on a computer-readable medium ...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. United States Letter Patent Number 6,226,752.

As per claim 1:

Gupta et al. teach a method for validating credentials comprising:

determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

Art Unit: 2133

determining whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

As per claim 2:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising granting a session credential to the client on the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential for the second system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

As per claim 3:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to the session credential on the first system. (Col. 12, lines 52-53)

As per claim 4:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential for the second system. (Col. 12, lines 54-60)

As per claim 6:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising maintaining the client session credential with the second system. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26)

As per claim 7:

Art Unit: 2133

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method wherein determining whether the client has a valid credential with the second system is at least partially from presenting at least some of the information from the session token. (Col. 12, lines 66-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-5)

As per claim 8:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method wherein retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query. (Col. 12, lines 48-61)

As per claim 9:

Gupta et al. teach a method for validating session credentials of a client comprising:

determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for a second system, wherein retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises receiving a session token from the client corresponding to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23)

Art Unit: 2133

determining whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system, wherein determining whether the client has a valid credential with the second system is at least partially from presenting information from the session token; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

granting a session credential to the client on the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to the session credential on the first system; (Col. 12, lines 52-53) and

maintaining the client session credentials. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26)

As per claim 10:

Gupta et al. teach a computer executable software code transmitted as an information signal, the code for validating credentials, the code comprising:

code to determine, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

code to retrieve, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

code to present at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

Art Unit: 2133

code to determine whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

As per claim 11:

Gupta et al. teach a computer readable medium having computer executable code stored thereon, the code for validating credentials, the code comprising:

code to determine, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

code to retrieve, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

code to present at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

code to determine whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

As per claim 12:

Gupta et al. teach a programmed computer for validating credentials, comprising: a memory having at least one region for storing computer executable program code; (Figure 1, item 115; Col. 7, lines 50-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-20) and

a processor for executing the program code stored in the memory, (Figure 1, item 113; Col. 7, lines 50-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-20) wherein the program code comprises:

Art Unit: 2133

code to determine, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

code to retrieve, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system; (Col. 7, lines 3-4; Col. 11, lines 66-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-6)

code to present at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

code to determine whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

As per claim 14:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising granting a session credential for the first system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

As per claim 15:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising granting a session credential for the second system. (Col. 12, lines 66-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-5)

As per claim 16:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26)

Art Unit: 2133

As per claim 17:

Gupta et al. teach a method for establishing session credentials comprising:
determining that a client does not have a valid session credential for a first system or a second system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)
sending, from the second system to the client, a log in page; (Col. 12, lines 24-32)
receiving, at the second system from the client, log in information; (Col. 12, lines 24-32) and
sending, from the second system to the first system, information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30) and
granting a session credential for the first system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

As per claim 18:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising granting a session credential for the second system. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

As per claim 19:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising associating session credentials for the first

Art Unit: 2133

system and the second system with the client. (Col. 12, lines 54-60; Col. 13, lines 24-26)

As per claim 20:

Gupta et al. teach a method for validating credentials comprising:

determining, at a first system, that a client does not have a valid session credential for the first system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

redirecting the client to a second system; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23)

sending, from the second system to the first system, session credentials for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

sending, from the second system to the first system, information indicating that the session credentials for the second system are valid. (Col. 7, lines 6-9; Col. 12, lines 25-30)

sending, from the first system to the second system, the session credentials for the second system; (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

determining, at the second system, that the session credentials for the second system, received from the first system, are valid; (Col. 13, lines 1-5) and

As per claim 21:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gupta et al. further disclose a method comprising granting the client session credentials for the first system. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. United States Letter Patent Number 6,226,752 further in view of Makower et al. United States Publication Number 2002/0184507.

As per claim 5:

Gupta et al. teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Gupta et al. do not explicitly disclose a method comprising directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential for the second system.

Makower et al. in analogous art, however, disclose a method comprising directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential for the second system. (Page 4, paragraph 31)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta et al. to include a method comprising directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential for the second system. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower et al. (Abstract) in order to implement a single-sign on protocol independent of the actual authentication mechanism used by different servers.

As per claim 13:

Gupta et al. teach a method for establishing session credentials comprising:
determining that a client does not have a valid session credential for a first system or a second system; (Col. 7, lines 2-3; Col. 11, lines 46-49 and lines 65-66)

sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; (Col. 7, lines 5-6; Col. 12, lines 13-23) and

receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information. (Col. 7, lines 10-12; Col. 12, lines 48-49)

Gupta et al. do not explicitly disclose a method comprising sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; and receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information.

Makower et al. in analogous art, however, disclose a method comprising:

sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; (Page 4, paragraph 32; ...web server prompts the client browser with a log in page ...)

receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; (Page 4, paragraph 32; the client browser provides authentication information...)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gupta et al. to include a method comprising sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; and receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Makower et al. (Abstract) in order to implement a single-sign on protocol independent of the actual authentication mechanism used by different servers.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892 attached.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2133

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay *SG*
Examiner
Art Unit 2133

02/25/05

Albert Decady
ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100